



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/637,216      | 08/08/2003  | Koji Sonoda          | 16869S-089800US     | 3324             |

20350 7590 06/30/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

CHEN, SHIN HON

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/637,216

Applicant(s)

SONODA ET AL.

Examiner

Shin-Hon Chen

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/8/03, 8/27/04.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 have been examined.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Mock et al.

U.S. Pub. No. 20020161757 (hereinafter Mock).

4. As per claim 1 and 14, Mock discloses a computer system comprising: a first storage device storing file management information, a first computer connected to said first storage device (Mock: [0046], [0221], [0222], and abstract), a second computer connected to said first computer via a network, and a second storage device storing file data managed by said file management information, connected to said second computer ((Mock: [0046], [0221], [0222], and abstract: managing distributed databases).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 3, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mock.

7. As per claim 2 and 15, Mock discloses computer system according to claims 1 and 14 respectively. Mock further discloses wherein when said first computer receives a request to file data stored in said second storage device (Mock: [0046]), said first computer confirms the contents of said file management information stored in said first storage device and in accordance with said file management information, and transmits to said second computer, a request of the file data that is the subject of said request to file data (Mock: [0046]): receive request); and based on said instructing request, said second computer updates said file data stored in said second storage device and transmits the result to said first computer (Mock: [0046]). Mock does not explicitly disclose update request. However, one with ordinary skill in the art would understand read/write request is essential tasks handled by database management system.

8. As per claim 3 and 16, Mock discloses computer system according to claims 2 and 15 respectively. Mock further discloses wherein when said first computer receives a request to read

Art Unit: 2131

file data stored in said second storage device, said first computer confirms the contents of said file management information stored in said first storage device and in accordance with said file management information transmits to said second computer a request instructing read of the file data that is the subject of said request to read file data, based on said instructing request, said second computer reads said file data stored in said second storage device and transmits said file data thus read to said first computer, and said first computer transmits said file data thus received to the originating sender of the request to read said file data (Mock: [0046]: retrieves data from external databases).

9. Claims 4-6 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mock in view of Kojima et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6681227 (hereinafter Kojima).

10. As per claim 4 and 17, Mock discloses a computer system according to claims 3 and 16 respectively. Mock discloses wherein said file management information includes information on file attributes, information on the storage location of file data and information on access rights to a file (Mock: [0046]: metadata standard). Kojima further discloses that limitation (Kojima: column 7 lines 35-43). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Kojima within the system of Mock because metadata standard is well known in the art.

11. As per claim 5 and 18, Mock as modified discloses a computer system according to claims 4 and 17 respectively. Mock further discloses wherein said file management information

Art Unit: 2131

includes a table managing only files possessing certain specified file attributes (Mock: [0046]: identify objects satisfy search criteria).

12. As per claim 6 and 19, Mock as modified discloses a computer system according to claims 5 and 18 respectively. Mock further discloses wherein as said first computer receives a request to read said file data or a request to update said file data, said first computer confirms whether or not a file specified by these requests is registered in said table and if registered, and performs processes in accordance with the file attributes of said table (Mock: [0048]-[0049]).

13. Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mock in view of Kojima and further in view of Garrison U.S. Pub. No. 20020069355 (hereinafter Garrison).

14. As per claim 7 and 20, Mock as modified discloses a computer system according to claims 6 and 19 respectively. Mock as modified does not explicitly disclose further discloses wherein a file attribute of said table is a file attribute for encryption, and as said first computer receives a request to read said file data, said first computer confirms whether or not the file specified by these requests is registered in said table for the encryption attribute, and if registered, said first computer encrypts the file data received from said second computer based on the information registered in said table for the encryption attribute and transmits said encrypted file data to the originator of said request. However, Garrison discloses server encrypts the data after retrieving data from database and transmit encrypted data to client (Garrison:

Art Unit: 2131

[0014]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use metadata to deliver content specified by client including encrypted data because metadata includes attributes of data that can be used to process data retrieval. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Garrison within the combination of Mock-Kojima because it protects certain data from unauthorized use.

15. Claim 8-10, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mock in view of Kojima and further in view of Garrison and further in view of Shear U.S. Pat. No. 5410598 (hereinafter Shear).

16. As per claim 8, Mock as modified disclose a computer system according to claim 7. wherein said file management information includes information necessary to calculate charges for a user using the computer system. However, Shear discloses database usage charge (Shear: column 9 lines 26-40). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Shear within the combination of Mock-Kojima-Garrison because charging for data usage is well known in the art.

17. As per claim 9, Mock as modified discloses a computer system according to claim 8. Mock wherein said necessary information includes information on the total volume of file data stored in said second storage device used by said user, information on the total volume of data written-in to said second storage device by said user and the total volume of data read from said

Art Unit: 2131

second storage device by said user, and wherein this information is managed by said second computer managing said second storage device (Shear: column 9 lines 26-40: charging based on database access is well known).

18. As per claim 10, Mock as modified discloses a computer system according to claim 9. wherein when said second computer receives from said first computer said request to update file data, said second computer transmits to said first computer information on the volume of data stored in said second storage device at the time of processing said request to update said file data and information on the increased data volume through the data update, and said first computer uses said information thus received to update the contents of said necessary information stored in said first storage device (Shear: meters database usage).

19. As per claim 12, Mock as modified discloses a computer system according to claim 8. Mock as modified further discloses the system comprising a plurality of said first computers and said first storage devices, wherein said information on file attributes and said necessary information are each stored in different said first storage devices and each managed by different said first computers (Mock: abstract and [0221] and [0222]).

20. As per claim 13, Mock as modified discloses a computer system according to claim 12. Mock as modified further disclose the system comprising a plurality of said second storage devices, wherein said file data is replicated and stored respectively in of said storage devices existing in plurality (Mock: [0221]-[0222]: distributed databases).



21. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mock in view of Kojima and further in view of Garrison and further in view of Shear and further in view of Hiroshi U.S. Pub. No. 20020152121 (hereinafter Hiroshi).

22. As per claim 11, Mock as modified discloses a computer system according to claim 10. Mock as modified does not explicitly disclose the system comprising a third computer and a third storage device connected to said third computer, wherein said third storage device holds information concerning accounting conditions in respect of each said second computer, and wherein said third computer reads-out said necessary information stored in said first storage device via said first computer and calculates charges applied to said user based on said necessary information thus read and said information concerning accounting conditions. However, Hiroshi discloses that limitation (Hiroshi: [0012]: charging server). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have a separate charging database to store calculate usage charges. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Hiroshi within the combination of Mock-Kojima-Garrison-Shear because it keeps record of usage charges.

### ***Conclusion***

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wissner et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20030158847 discloses scalable database management system.

Douceur et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20030172089 discloses file availability in distributed file storage systems.

Buxton U.S. Pub. No. 20030204856 discloses distributed server video-on-demand system.

Tsuchida et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20020107876 discloses method for managing multiple database storage units.

Hsiao et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6564215 discloses update support in database content management.

Koontz et al. U.S. Pat. No. 20020073189 discloses remote system management via DBMS stored procedures.

Nilsen et al. U.S. Pat. No. 5668986 discloses method for handling data storage requests in a distributed database environment.

Lin et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6052785 discloses multiple remote data access security mechanism for multi-tiered Internet computer networks.

Hotti et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20020169745 discloses method for the management of database schemas.

Joseph et al. U.S. Pub. No. 20030065646 discloses database interface architecture with time-based load balancing in a real-time environment.

Art Unit: 2131


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Hon Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shin-Hon Chen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2131

SC

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100